IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No. 8375 of 1990

For Approval and Signature:

HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

==========

1	Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?
2	To be referred to the Reporter or not ?
3	Whether their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgment ?
4	Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the constitution of India, 1950 or any order made thereunder ?
5	Whether it is to be circulated to the civil judge ?

==========

JAYENDRA A RANPURA - Petitioner
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT & 2 - Respondents

==========

Appearance :
MR JV MEHTA for Petitioner.
MR LB DABHI, AGP for Respondent No. 1.
RULE NOT RECD BACK for Respondent(s) : 2,
RULE SERVED BY DS for Respondent(s) : 3,

==========

CORAM : HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

Date : 23/02/2006

ORAL JUDGMENT

1.The petitioner has filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying for the direction to the respondents not to terminate the services of the petitioner.

2.The petition was admitted on 04.12.1990 and ad-interim relief was granted restraining the respondents from terminating the services of the petitioner.

3.It is the case of the petitioner that the petitioner was appointed as Clerk-cum-Typist in L.D. Engineering College, Ahmedabad on daily wages and he has worked as a daily wager from 16.09.1986 to 30.11.1986, 01.12.1986 to 28.02.1987, 03.03.1987 to 31.05.1987 and from 01.08.1987 to 30.09.1987. It is also the case of the petitioner that an advertisement was

published by the respondent No. 3 in the daily Newspaper 'Gujarat Samachar' dated 06.08.1987 for the post of Clerk-cum-Typist in the pay scale of Rs. 750-50-1500 and the petitioner applied for the same. The petitioner was called for interview on 14.09.1987 and he was selected vide order dated 28.09.1987. After his selection, he was sent for medical examination and he was successful in the medical examination and certificate for the same was issued by the Civil Surgeon, Ahmedabad.

4.The petitioner has filed Special Civil Application No. 6029 of 1990 claiming all benefits of regular employee. The said petition was dismissed by an order dated 08.11.1990. The petitioner was harassed and was given threat of termination. The petitioner, therefore, filed the present petition.

5.Mr. J.V. Mehta, learned advocate appearing for

the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was appointed on the regular establishment of the respondent No. 3 vide order dated 05.03.1991. He has placed on record the copy of the said order.

6.In view of the said order, the grievance of the petitioner is redressed and the petition has become infructuous.

7.The petition is disposed of as having become infructuous. Rule discharged without any order as to costs.

[K.A. PUJ, J.]

S*avariya*